

## TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

### I. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SF 254/255

The Architect-Engineer Evaluation Board (AEEB) will evaluate the firms based on: 1) the written data contained in the individual Standard Form 254 (SF 254) Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire provided for the prime and each team subcontractor; 2) the written data contained in blocks 1-3 of the individual Standard Form 255 (SF 255) Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire for Specific Project; 3) the written data contained in the joint SF 255 (prime and team subcontractors); and, 4) the oral presentation of blocks 8 and 10 of SF 255 which address evaluation criteria No. 4 Specialized Experience and Technical Competence.

The AEEB will employ the Scoring Plan described in the Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Agency (EPAAR) 1515.608(a)(1) to evaluate criteria Nos 1 through 5.2. The contracting officer will evaluate criteria No. 5 using the Scoring Plan described in the EPAAR 1515.608(a)(1) and will evaluate criteria No. 6 using a level of confidence assessment rating (LOCAR) which is described later on in this document.

Criteria	Evaluation Score	x	Factor of 0.20	Max Points	=	Evaluation Points
1. Professional Qualifications				10		
2. Capacity to Perform the Work				10		
3. Location				10		
4. 1. Program Management				20		
4.2. On-site Projects				40		
5. Accomplishments Small Disadvantaged Business				10		
6. Past Performance				30		
Total				130		

#### 1. Professional Qualifications

10 Points

The firm will be evaluated on the demonstrated qualification of its State licensed professional civil, chemical and geotechnical engineers to design remedial actions and to perform construction management for implementing remedial actions.

## **2. Capacity to Perform the Work**

10 Points

Taking into consideration current and projected workload commitments, the firm will be evaluated on its ability to provide available, experienced and fully trained personnel at the skill levels, disciplines, and quantities to perform the stated volume of work.

## **3. Location**

10 Points

The firm will be evaluated on its experience, during the past seven years, in managing and maintaining an office located in the general San Francisco area and expertise in providing technical and management services to States, private potential responsible parties, EPA or other Federal agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in support of EPA's coordination and oversight of remedial activities particularly with regard to the sites located in EPA Region IX.

## **4. Specialized Experience and Technical Competence**

The firm will be evaluated on its specialized experience and technical competence in the categories listed below based upon on-going or completed contracts/projects in which the technical work fell within the past seven years.

### **4.1. Program Management**

20 Points

The firm, as prime contractor, will be evaluated on its ability to provide efficient contract administration (generic activities that are not directly or indirectly applicable to site specific work assignments) and program support organization which ensures that all the work assignments are planned, monitored, completed and reported on in a timely, cost-effective, and highly competent manner for contracts similar in size and scope to this RACS contract.

### **4.2. On-site Projects:**

40 Points

The firm will be evaluated on its ability to provide professional architect/engineer services to support remedial planning and oversight activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA). These services include:

- remedial investigation and feasibility studies (RI/FS)
- engineering services to design remedial actions (RD)
- construction management for implementing remedial actions and non-time critical removal actions, including issuing and managing subcontracts for construction of the selected remedy and engineering services in overseeing construction
- engineering evaluation and cost analysis for non-time critical removal actions
- risk assessment
- enforcement support, including oversight of remedial investigations/feasibility

- studies, remedial design, and remedial action  
other technical assistance, including treatability studies

## **5. Accomplishments Utilizing Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns** 10 Points

The contracting officer will contact the presidents of the Small Disadvantaged Businesses that the prime employed on its federal contracts and evaluate whether the prime performed professional architect/engineer services described above in criteria 5.2, On-site Projects, through the use of team subcontractors that qualified as Small Disadvantaged Business concerns. The evaluation will be based upon on-going or completed contracts/projects in which the technical work was performed within the past seven years. These projects will be evaluated to determine the prime's ability to keep its promise to meet EPA's subcontracting goal for utilizing Small Disadvantaged Business concerns and effectively implementing a Mentor Protégé Program..

## **6. Past Performance** 30 Points

Based on past performance information obtained from any reference or performance evaluation report associated with the firm's on-going or completed projects/contracts cited in blocks 8, 9 and 10 of SF 255, the contracting officer will develop a level of confidence assessment rating (LOCAR) for each firm for the criteria No. 4.1, Program Management and No. 4.2, On-site Projects. This ranking will reflect the Government's degree of confidence that the firm will keep the promises made in its proposal.

The contracting officer will consider the following factors when developing the LOCAR.

- (1) Client corroboration of the facts and claims presented in the firms's project summary
- (2) Was the client satisfied with the quality of deliverables and work performed?
- (3) Were deliverables delivered and work performed in accordance with the times specified in the reports of work and work assignments?
- (4) Were the costs incurred during contract performance in line with the costs proposed in the contract cost proposal and individual work assignment work plans?
- (5) Was client satisfied with the firm's responsiveness in resolving issues or problems that occurred during performance?
- (6) Did the client conduct business in an ethical and professional manner?
- (7) Would client hire the firm to perform this or a similar project in the future?

### **LOCAR SCALE**

Excellent - LOCAR of +0.5 - A significant majority of the sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance, quality of service, timeliness of performance, and cost control, was superior and that they would unhesitatingly do business with the offeror again.

Good - LOCAR of +0.25 Most sources of information state that the offeror's performance, quality of service, timeliness of performance, and cost control, was good, with some superior features and that they would willingly do business with the offeror again.

None - LOCAR RATING OF 0 - Most sources of information state that the offeror's performance, quality of service, timeliness of performance, and cost control, was adequate, or no record exists, or the sources of information are roughly divided over the quality of the offeror's performance.

Marginal - LOCAR of -0.25 - Many source of information make unfavorable responses about the offerors performance, quality of service, timeliness of performance, and cost control, and either express serious doubt about doing business with the offeror again or state that they would refuse to do so.

Poor- LOCAR of -0.5 - A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance, quality of service, timeliness of performance, and cost control, was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the offeror again under any circumstance.

The following chart is an example of a worksheet that demonstrates how the past performance score will be calculated.

Criteria	LOCAR	X	Max Points	=	Past Performance Score
5. 1. Program Management			20		
5.2. On-site Projects			40		
Total Maximum	+0.5		60		30